

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang (U.S. P. 5,392,679). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

To be in anticipation, all of the claim limitations must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson Fee Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The Office Action asserts that the claimed invention is anticipated by Wang based on taking elements from both Figures 1 and 4 and asserting them to be equivalent to the invention recited in claim 1, for example. However, in Wang, Figure 1 illustrates the prior art, Figure 4 illustrates the inventive table saw. Thus, the elements asserted to be equivalent to Applicant's claimed invention come from two different table saws and are not "arranged as in the claim". For this reason alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by the Wang patent. In particular, among other things, the Office Action asserts that the claimed through hole transversely extended through two opposite sides [of the adjustment members] above the second positioning unit, through which a screw bolt is inserted and fastened to the mounting hole of the corresponding mounting seat of the suspension arm is found in Wang's element 46. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Wang, the lock element 46 is disposed in the top end of the inside wall of each lock block 41, and has a rounded edge portion and an internally central threaded portion 461. However, the lock element 46 and the threaded portion 461 are not through holes transversely extended through the adjustment members 40. The claimed construction of the through hole allows adjustment of the position of the saw by adjustment of only one bolt, that is, the screw bolt inserted through the through hole and mounting hole as recited in claim 1. This is not taught by Wang. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Wang patent.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from and include the recitations of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits these claims are patentable in and of themselves, and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 4 recites that the mounting hole of each mounting seat of the suspension arm is an arched elongated mounting hole. The Office Action asserts that this feature is found in mounting hole 321 and 322, in particular, that mounting hole 321 is elongated at 322 and arched at 321. However, Applicant respectfully submits element 322 refers to a V shaped notch that is formed in the upper part of the position claim 32 to allow the hacksaw 50 to be operated therein. Column 3 lines 20-24. The rounded tip portion 321 is aligned with lock element 46. Column 3 lines 24-25 and 47-49. Applicant respectfully submits that these elements do not constitute the claimed arched elongated mounting hole. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable in and of itself and as it

depends from and includes the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 5 depends from Claim 4 and is therefore believed to be patentable in and of itself and as it depends from and includes the recitations of claim 4 for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 6 depends from claim 2 and recites that each mounting seat of the suspension arm has an arched fender and a bottom side, the arched fender having a center of circle identical to the imaginary center of circle. The Office Action asserts that the arched fender 122 in Figure 2 corresponds to the claimed arched fender. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Once again, Figure 2 is a prior art table saw to the table saw disclosed in Wang shown in Figure 4. Therefore the combining of the teachings of Figure 2 and Figure 4 and asserting anticipation is improper as discussed above.

Additionally, the table saw disclosed in Figure 4 does not have an arched fender. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentable in and of itself and as it depends from and includes the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, the Office Action again combines the teachings of Figure 2 with the teachings of Figure 4. This is improper for the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8 are patentable in and of themselves, and as they depend from and include the recitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to correct a typographical error.


Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment is not a narrowing amendment and is made only to correct the inadvertent error.

In view the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (202)628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Ronni S. Jillions
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:ft
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BND\dire\Chen336\PTO\Amd17FEB04.doc